

Translated from
'Qurratul Aynayn bi Jawab Nurul Aynayn' (pp. 164-182)
of
Shaykh Rayhan Jawaid

Translated by:
Zeeshan Ahmed

Edited by:
Abul Hasan

The narration of Akhbarul Fuqaha wal Muhaddithin (of Imam Muhammad ibn Harith al-Khushani):

Uthman ibn Muhammad narrated to me, he said that 'Ubaydullah ibn Yahya said to me: Uthman ibn Sawada ibn 'Abbad narrated to me from Hafs ibn Maysara from Zayd ibn Aslam from 'Abdullah ibn 'Umar (ra); he said:

'We would, with the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) in Makka, raise our hands at the beginning of Salah and within Salah at the time of ruku'. Then when the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) migrated to Madina, he left raising the hands within Salah at the time of ruku' and continued to raise the hands at the beginning of Salah.' [Akhbarul Fuqaha wal Muhaddithin, p. 214, Abu Shu'ayb [Rayhan Jawaid] said: Its chain of transmission is authentic (isnaduhu Sahih)]

Benefit:

In this authentic narration it clearly displays the Makki and the Madani practice. I mean that raising of the hands began in Makka and stayed during the Madani period until Allah willed. Then in the latter days it was abrogated and left, while the initial raising of the hands continued. This is Sunna and upon this the Ahlus Sunna wal Jama'a Hanafis and other than them practice.

Analysing the Sanad:

1) Imam Abu Abdillah ibn Harith al-Qairawani al-Maliki (died in 361 AH)

This is a famous Imam and Muhaddith. The Imams have called him Hafiz Abu Abdillah al Khushani al-Qairawani al-Maghribi and he has written many books. The

Hafiz stayed in Qurtuba (nazeelul qurtabah). Al Hafiz sahibul tawaaleef. Min ahl al ilm wal fadhl faqeeh muhaddith. wa kana Hafiz aalim bil fatyaa. husnul qiyaas waliyyul shuraa. wa sannafa fi al fiqh wat tareekh wa ghayruhaa. He is authentic (thiqa) by consensus.

See - Tadhkiratul Huffaz, 3/138-139, al-Ibar, 1/359, Siyar a'lam an-nubala, 10/429 (all three of these are by Hafiz Shamsud-Din al-Dhahabi), Jadhwatul Muqtabis lil Humaydi, p. 47, Bughyatul Multamis, p. 61, Ta'rikh Ulama al-Andalus (of ibn al Faradi), p. 383-384, ad-Dibaj lil Sam'ani, 5/130, Tartibul Madarik (of Qadi Iyad), 4/513, Mu'jamul Udaba (of Yaqut al-Hamawi), 8/111, Tabaqatul Huffaz lil Suyuti, p. 398

2) Imam Uthman bin Muhammad al Qabari (d. 320 AH)

He is also a famous Imam. Scholars have praised him and authenticated him. For example

من اهل قبره ... ممن عني بطلب العلم و درس المسائل و عقد الوثائق مع فضله و كان مفتي اهل موضعه.... من اهل قبرة كان معنيا بالعلم حافظا للمسائل عاقدا للشروط مفتي اهل موضعه

(Akhbarul Fuqaha wal Muhaddithin lil Qayrawani p. 216, Bughyatul Multamis lil Dabbi p 359, Ta'rikh Ulama al-Andalus of ibn al Faradi p 243, Jadhwatul Muqtabis lil Humaydi p 270 and others.)

3) Imam Ubaydullah bin Yahya Qurtubi (d. 298 AH)

He is a famous Imam (It is said about him):

الفقيه الامام المعبر القرطبي مسند قرطبة ... و كان كبير القدر وافر الجلالة و كان كريما عاقلا عظيم الجاه والمال ما في الشوري منفردا برءاسة البلاء غير مدافع. فقيه قرطبة و مسند الاندلس و كان ذا حرمة عظيمة و جلالة. و كان عقلا وقورا وافر الحرمة عظيم الجاه... تام المروة عزيز النفس عزيز المعروف و كان محمد بن ابراهيم بن حيون ثني عليه و يوثق

He is thiqa (trustworthy) by consensus. See Siyar a'lam an-Nubala, 9/294-295, al Ibar, 1/271, Akhbarul Fuqaha wal Muhaddithin lil-Qayrawani, pp. 170-173, Jadhwatul Muqtabis lil Humaydi, p. 237, Ta'rikh Ulama al-Andalus of ibn al-Faradi, pp. 206-207, Ta'rikh al-Islam lil Dhahabi, 22/200, Bughyatul Multamis li Dabbi, al Wafayat, p. 197, Shadharatul Dhahab, 2/231 and others.

4) Imam Uthman ibn Sawada al Qurtubi (died ca. 235 AH)

Scholars have said:

كان ثقة مقبولا عند القضاة و الحكام و كان من اهل الخير و الفضل و كان من اهل الزهد و العبادة و كثرة التلاوة

See Akhbarul Fuqaha wal Muhaddithin, p. 214, and Ta'rikh Ulama al-Andulus, p. 242

5) Imam Hafs bin Maysara al San'ani (d. 181 AH)

He is a narrator found in Bukhari and Muslim. Scholars have said he is thiqa (trustworthy), a person of Hadith (sahibul hadith) and thiqa. There is nothing wrong with him. He is thiqa by consensus. See al-Ibar, 1/216 and Tahdhib al-Tahdhib (of ibn Hajar al-Asqalani), 1/570

6) Imam Zayd bin Aslam al Madni (d. 136 AH)

He is a narrator of Bukhari and Muslim. Scholars have said

الحافظ الفقيه المدني و كان من العلماء الابرار ثقة من اهل الفقه و العلم و كان عالما بتفسير القران و كان كثير الحديث

See Tadhkiratul Huffaz, 1/99-100, al Ibar, 1/141, Tahdhib al-Tahdhib, 2/231-232

7) Hadhrat Abdullah bin Umar (d. 74 AH, radiallahu anhu)

A famous Companion (Sahabi).

Conclusion - The hadith of Ibn Umar (ra) by way of chain (sanad) is authentic. And by way of wording (matn) it clarifies the Prophet's (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) practice of abrogating the raising of the hands in the end of the Madinan period, and this is correct, the truth, and acceptable to practice as a continuous Sunna.

The replies of the objections to this hadith:

First objection-

Zubayr Ali Zai writes that this book does not have a mentioned chain (see his Nur al-

Aynayn, p. 205, printed in 2006-2007 by Maktaba Islamiyya, Faisalabad)

Reply-

A famous Imam's book which has been linked famously to the Imam makes looking at the isnad not needed. As Imam Ibn Hajr has clarified this principle

لان الكتاب المشهور الغني بشهرته عن اعتبار الاسناد الي مصنفه (النكت علي ابن صلاح

Because of this, the objection is against this principle, hence leaving it rejected and void.

Second objection-

Zubayr Ali Zai writes that at the end of this book the completion is written 'in Sha'ban the year 483' (after Hijra). Meaning, that this book was completed 122 years after the demise of the mentioned author Muhammad ibn Harith al Qairawani (d. 361 AH). Who is the one who wrote Akhbarul Fuqaha and who completed it? This is not known hence this book is not established as being one of Muhammad bin Harith's. (See his Nur al-Aynayn, p. 206)

First reply-

483 in reality is a copyist error who instead of writing 3 on the left, he wrote it on the right. It should have been written 384. These type of copyist errors are common as is not hidden from the people of knowledge.

Second reply-

This book was written by Muhammad ibn Harith, 13 years before his demise (taking the first reply into consideration). It is also possible that the copyist had completed arranging (tartib) the book at 483. Examples of this

a) Imam ibn Hibban (d. 354 AH) collected Sahih ibn Hibban. But Ibn Balban (d. 739 AH) arranged the work 321 years after the demise of Ibn Hibban. The name of the book is al Ihsaan bi tartib Sahih ibn Hibban.

b) In the same way, Imam al-Tahawi (d. 321 AH) wrote his work Sharh Mushkil al-Athar. The arranging of this book was done by Dr. Abu Hussain Khalid Mahmud, who is a contemporary, by placing the book with fiqhi chapters. And it was published by the name Tuhfatul Idhyaar bi Tartib Sharh Mushkil al-Athar. And no one scholar rejected the authorship of the two scholars. Likewise is the state of the compiler of this book Akhbarul Fuqaha wal Muhaddithin.

Third reply-

Imam Bukhari (d. 256 AH) compiled his work Sahih al Bukhari. Then this book was arranged by ibn Yusuf al Farabri (d. 320 AH) and other than him. But who is the copyist for the present form and when did he write it? His name is not known. Even though the copyist of Sahih al Bukhari is not known, his connection with Imam Bukhari remains intact. Same way the copyist of Akhbarul Fuqaha wal Muhddithin, his connection remains established with Imam Muhammad bin Harith.

Hence this objection is rejected and void.

Third objection-

Zubayr Ali Zai writes that this narrator, Uthman ibn Muhammad, can not be specified without any evidence. So to say it is Uthman bin Muhammad ibn Ahmed bin Mudrik is wrong. Even so the meeting of Ibn Mudrik and Muhammad bin Harith Qairawani has no evidence.

First Reply-

Mr Zubayr Ali Zai, for your information the specification (ta'yeen) of Uthman bin Muhammad is established. He is Imam Uthman bin Ahmed bin Mudrik min ahli qabrihi (d. 320 AH). Ponder over the following!

1) قد قال الامام الحافظ المحدث الفقيه محمد بن حارث القيرواني المالكي قال لي عثمان بن محمد القبري قال لي محمد بن غالب (Akhbarul Fuqaha p 103)

2) قال محمد بن حارث القيرواني قال لي عثمان بن محمد القبري قال لي محمد بن غالب (Ibid p105)

Imam Muhammad bin Harith himself clarified that he (Uthman ibn Muhammad) is al Qabari. Because him being ibn Mudrik has been specified with a clear evidence. And it is a slap on the face on a Muhaqqiq (researcher) like Zubayr Ali Zai! Because of this Uthman bin Muhammad al Qabari is specified with an evidence.

Second Reply-

The meeting of Imam Muhammad bin Harith al-Qairawani and Uthman ibn Muhammad al-Qabari is established. For example

قال محمد بن حارث القيرواني قال لي عثمان بن محمد قال لي محمد بن غالب

(Akhbarul Fuqaha p. 78)

قال محمد القيرواني قال لي عثمان بن محمد
(Ibid p. 97 and p. 122)

قال محمد القيرواني قال لي عثمان بن محمد
(Ibid p 162)

قال محمد القيرواني قال لي عثمان بن محمد سمعت محمد بن غالب
(p14- قضاة قرطبة و علماء افريقة للقيرواني)

قال محمد القيرواني قال لي عثمان بن محمد اخبرني ابي
(ibid 103)

قال محمد القيرواني قال لي عثمان بن محمد
(ibid 153)

Because of this the meeting of Muhammad bin Harith and Uthman ibn Muhammad bin Ahmed bin Mudrik is established like a shining light.

Third reply-

Imam Muhammad bin Harith al-Qairawani's meeting with Imam Uthman bin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Mudrik from the people of Qabara (d. 320 AH) is established clearly- For example:

قال محمد القيرواني اخبرني عثمان بن محمد
(Akhbarul Fuqaha p 90)

قال محمد القيرواني اخبرني عثمان بن محمد
(ibid p 122)

و قال محمد القيرواني و حدثني عثمان بن محمد قال حدثني ابو مروان عبيد الله بن يحيى
(Quda Qurtaba lil Qairawani p 15)

و قال محمد القيرواني اخبرني عثمان بن محمد قال اخبرني عبيد الله بن يحيى عن ابيه
(ibid p 55)

Because of this the meeting and the hearing (sama') of the two is clearly established as the wording akhbarani and haddathani is used. So Ali Zai's research is termed as void.

Fourth objection-

Zubayr writes that Imam al-Dhahabi writes-

Uthman bin Muhammad bin Khashish al Qairawani from ibn Ghanim the Qadi of

Africa, I think he is a liar (khadhdhab) (al-Mughni fi al Du'afa, 2/50)

Uthman bin Muhammad from Qairawan is a liar. And Muhammad bin Harith is also from Qairawan. Hence, what becomes apparent is that Uthman bin Muhammad over here is referring to that liar.

Reply-

When Imam Muhammad bin Harith has already specified Uthman bin Muhammad al Qabari (d. 320 AH), as has passed, then this objection doesn't fit right. And those books of rijal which we have, nowhere is there mention of Muhammad bin Harith al-Qairawani as having a teacher (ustadh) named Uthman bin Muhammad Khashish al Qairawani. So we ask Janab Zubayr Ali Zai, from which evidence did he specify the individual to be Uthman bin Muhammad Khashish al Qairawani? His simply being from Qairawan is not an evidence. This type of specification was done by the infamous rejecter of hadith 'Tumna Ammari', with the hadith of Abu Hurayra (in Bukhari) chapter of the descent of Isa ibn Maryam (alaihis salam), where he rejected the specification of the narrator being Ishaq bin Rahawayh. He also used the same logic and said Ya'qub bin Ibrahim al Madani and Ishaq bin Muhammad Al Madani are both Madani, hence he based his specification (ta'yeen) on that. Whereas on an academic level the students of Imam Ya'qub bin Ibrahim al Madani are Ishaq bin Rahawayh and Ishaq bin Mansur not Ishaq bin Muhammad (Tahdhibul Kamal lil Mizzi, v. 2 p. 20, 24, v. 20, p. 415, 516). This is the same method adopted by Zubayr Ali which is clearly rejected and void.

Fifth objection-

Zubayr Ali Zai writes 'It should be remembered that Uthman ibn Muhammad bin Ahmed bin Mudrik's being reliable (thiqah) is not known'.

Reply-

That Imam who has been praised by the Muhaddithin then that is authentication and showing reliability (ta'dil wa tawthiq) for him. For example-

- قال يوسف بن ربحان سمعت محمد بن اسماعيل البخاري يقول كان علي بن المديني يسألني عن شيوخ خراسان....الي ان قال.... 1)
كل من اثبت عليه فهو عندنا الرضا و في نسخة عندنا الرضا
(Tahdhib al-Tahdhib, 5/35 and Ta'liq ala'l Raf wal Takmil, p. 136)

2) Shaykh Abdul Fattah Abu Ghudda says in his notes on Raf' wa Takmil:

تكفي لتحديد مرتبة قولهم في الراوي رضا فانه عندهم بمعنى ثقة او عدل

1) The Imam of Jarh and Ta'deel, Khalid bin S'ad al Qurtubi (d. 352 AH) says

Uthman bin Muhammad

من اهل قبره ... ممن عنى بطلب العلم و درس المسائل و عقد الوثائق مع فضله و كان مفتي اهل موضعه
(Akhbarul Fuqaha p 216)

Note:

Imam Khalid bin S'ad al Qurtubi al Andalusī was a great Muhaddith and an Imam of Asma al Rijal (names of narrators) and I'la al Hadith (hidden defects in Hadith). Just like in the East was the master of the Huffaz, the Imam of Jarh and Ta'deel, Yahya ibn Ma'een al Hanafi, then from the West was Imam Khalid bin S'ad. And he is a person deserving praise. (See Ta'rikh Ulama al Andalus p 113, Jadhwatul Muqtabis, p. 180, al Ibar lil Dhahabi, v.1, p. 347, Tadhkiratul Huffaz, v.3, p 89)

2) Muhammad bin Harith said similar to Khalid bin S'ad. (Akhbarul Fuqaha, p 216)

3) Imam Abdullah bin Muhammad known as ibn al Faradi al-Andalusī says:

من اهل قبرة كان معتنيا بالعلم حافظا للمسائل عاقدا للشروط مفتي اهل موضعه
(Ta'rikh Ulama al-Andalus, p. 243)

4) Imam al-Humaydi al-Andalusī said 'Uthman bin Muhammad bin Ahmed bin Mudrik from Qabara, he died in Andalus in the year 320. (Jadhwatul Muqtabis lil Humaydi, p 270)

Sixth objection-

Zubayr Ali Zai writes 'Uthman bin Sawada bin Abbad's state is not found in any book other than Akhbarul Fuqaha.... because Uthman bin Muhammad is inauthentic (majruh) or unknown (majhul), and because of this the authentication (tawthiq) of Ubaydullah bin Yahya is not established. Conclusion is that Uthman bin Sawada is majhul al Haal (unknown in status as a reliable narrator). His date of birth and death are unknown'.

First reply-

Imam Uthman bin Sawada bin Abbad al Qurtubi's (I think he died in 235 AH) mention comes in other than Akhbarul Fuqaha (See Ta'rikh Ulama al Andalus of ibn al-Faradi, p 242, no. 890, printed in Beirut) with authentication (tawthiq). It should be remembered that a narrators birth and death date being unknown does not result in him being majhul al haal. If this is your principle then we find these types of narrators in Sahih al Bukhari whose birth and death date are unknown. Does that mean they are Majhul al Haal?

Because of this Uthman bin Sawada is authentic and truthful with certainty. And putting an objection against him is rejected and void.

Second reply-

Imam Uthman bin Muhammad is not Majhul al Haal nor majruh, because the Imam of al-Jarh wa Ta'dil, the Muhaddith (hadith scholar) and Naqid (critic), Khalid bin S'ad (d. 352 AH), Imam Muhammad bin Harith (d. 361 AH) the Muhaddith, Faqih (jurisprudent) and Naqid, and also Imam, Hafiz, Muhaddith and Naqid, ibn al-Faradi (d. 403 AH), Imam, Hafiz, Muhaddith, Naqid, al Humaydi (d. 388 AH) have all praised him. And Imam Ubaydullah bin Yahya (d. 298 AH), who is a famous Muhaddith, has done clear ta'dil and tawthiq of him (See Akhbar al-Fuqaha, p. 214, Ta'rikh Ulama al-Andalus, p. 242 and others)

Because of this, with certainty Uthman bin Sawada is trustworthy (thiqah) and truthful (saduq).

Challenge - I give a challenge to Zubayr Ali Zai and the non madhabists, that they produce against Uthman bin Muhammad al Qabari a Jarh (disparagement) which is explained (mufassar) and the reason is clarified (bayyin al sabab). Then we will give them 10, 000 rupees. 'Bring your evidence if you are truthful'.

Seventh objection-

Ali Zai writes 'Uthman bin Sawada's meeting with Hafs bin Maysara is not established. Hafs passed away in 181 AH (see Nur al-Aynayn, p. 207)

Reply-

Imam Uthman bin Sawada al Qurtubi is the teacher of Imam Ubaydullah bin Yahya al Qurtubi (d. 298 AH). And he is the student of Hafs bin Maysara (d. 181 AH). Imam Uthman bin Sawada passed away approx (d. 235 AH). These dates show a possibility in meeting. And dates and the possibility of meeting are clearly showing connection (ittisal) according to Imam Muslim. This is the stance of the majority. (Muqaddima Muslim, p. 21)

With this, the objection is false and void and the Hadith is fully connected (muttasil) and Sahih (authentic) – And all praise be to Allah.

Eighth Objection-

Zubayr Ali Zai writes that from the books of Muhammad bin Harith is *Akhbarul Qudawal Muhaddithin*, but the name *Akhbarul Fuqaha wal Muhaddithin* is not found.... and the early scholars failed to mention it. (Nur al-Aynayn, p. 207-8)

Reply-

Zubayr Ali Zai should know that the early scholars have mentioned it, but Mr, Zubayr missed it-

1) Imam Abu Muhammad Ibn Hazm al-Andalusi al-Zahiri who died in 456 AH (See Jadhwatul al-Muqtabis of al-Humaydi, p. 47)

2) Imam Abu Umar Ibn Abd al-Barr al-Andalusi al-Qurtubi, who died in 463 AH (Ibid and Bughyatul Multamis, p. 61)

3) Imam Abu Muhammad al-Humaydi al-Andalusi (d. 488 AH) said that Muhammad bin Harith al-Khushani was from the people of knowledge and virtue. He was a Faqih and Muhaddith. He narrated from Ibn Waddah and the like of him. He gathered another book regarding the narrations of the judges of Andalus (Akhbarul Quda bil Andalus) and a book **Akhbarul Fuqaha wal Muhaddithin**. (Jadhwatul Muqtabis p. 37)

4) Imam al-Hafiz al-Muhaddith Ahmed bin Yahya al-Dabbi (d. 599 AH) said that Muhammad bin Harith al- Khushuni... He gathered a book regarding the narrations of the judges of Andalus (Akhbarul Quda bil Andalus) and another book **Akhbarul Fuqaha wal Muhaddithin**. (Bughyatul Multamis fi Ta'rikh Rijal Ahl al-Andalus, p. 61)

Because of this, if Imam Ibn Makula (d. 476 AH) and Imam Abu Sa'd as-Sam'ani (d. 562 AH) did not mention the book, then (it doesn't matter) as they are later (then scholars mentioned above). Even so, then not mentioning of something does not necessitate its negation as Zubayr Ali has also attested to (this principle). See Nurul Aynayn, p87, 81,140,219,222).

Allama Umar Rida Kahhala and Allama Khayrud-Din al-Zirikli and other than them mentioning this book were correct. (Mu'jam al- Mu'allifin, v3, p. 204, al-I'lam v. 6, p75). Hence, Akhbarul Fuqaha wal Muhaddithin was a work of Imam Muhammad bin Harith.

Ninth Objection-

Zubayr Ali Zai writes that this is from the unusual (gharib) narrations, so these aberrant (shadh) narrations are weak (Nur al-Aynayn, p. 208).

(First reply):

For example-

1) Imam al-Hakim says - A type from them is unusual narrations which are authentic (Ghara'ib as-Sahih). An example of that is what Imam al-Bukhari narrates in al-Jami' al-Sahih from Khallad ibn Yahya al-Makki from Abdul Wahid ibn Ayman. Thus, this hadith is authentic although Abdul Wahid bin Ayman is the sole narrator from his father. So this is Ghara'ib as-Sahih. (Ma'rifat al-Ulum al-Hadith, p. 94)

2) Imam al-Hakim says that Imam Muslim narrates in his al-Musnad al-Sahih from Abu Bakr Ibn Abi Shaybah and other than him from Sufyan and it is Gharib al-Hadith. (Ibid p. 95)

3) And clearly Imam al-Suyuti shows that the first hadith and last hadith of Bukhari are Gharib. (Tadrib al-Rawi, v. 3, pp. 164-165)

Hence, to do disparagement (jarh) based upon strangeness (gharaba) is rejected and void! And the hadith of Ibn Umar is Sahih.

Second Reply-

To Zubayr Ali Zai-

As for the Muhaddithin, aberrant (shadh) has two definitions. For example

1) Imam al-Hakim says- As for shadh then it is that narration which a trustworthy narrator (thiqa) narrates solely from thiqa (trustworthy narrators). And there is not follow up of that thiqa narrator (Mutabi). (See Ma'rifat ulum al-hadith, p. 199 and Tadrib al-Rawi, v. 1, p194-195)

Zubayr Ali writes over here that shadh is weak (da'eef) but in another place he writes 'if a trustworthy narrator (thiqa rawi) is alone, then this type of shadh is accepted' (al-Hadith magazine, p. 45, no. 53)

2) Imam Shafi'i says:

ليس الشاذ من الحديث ان يروي الثقة و الا يروي غيره هذا ليس بشاذ. انما الشاذ ان يروي الثقة حديثا يخالف فيه الناس هذا الشاذ من الحديث

(Ma'rifat ulum al-Hadith, p. 119 and Tadrib al-Rawi, v1, p193-194)

This means that a shadh hadith is that hadith in which a trustworthy (thiqa) narrator is alone and no thiqa narrator has followed (mutaba'a) him up.

Shadh is that narration in which a thiqa narrator narrates something contrary to

other thiqa narrators.

It should be kept in mind that according to the first definition of shadh, then it confirms this hadith because it has been narrated solely (tafarrud) from thiqa (trustworthy narrators). And tafarrud from thiqa is accepted according to most of the Fuqaha and Muhaddithin. As for the second definition of shadh, then it also confirms this hadith as the hadith does not contradict thiqa.

Note- Rather this hadith is not shadh from any angle, as there are follow ups (shawahidat) which are authentically available and nor does it contradict thiqa, as it is not hidden from the people of knowledge.

This shows that this objection is null and void and all praise is for Allah.

Third reply-

The narration of Ibn Umar in leaving raful yadayn (raising of the hands) at the time of ruku' is a trustworthy increase (ziyadat thiqa). And the ziyadat of the Sahih and Hasan narrators are obligatory (wajib) to accept.

1) Imam al-Bukhari says that ziyada are accepted and that mufassar (the explained) decides upon the vague (mubham) when narrated from authentic narrators (ahl al-thabt)... he also said 'there is no difference in that some narration increase upon others and the ziyada (additional wording) are accepted from the people of knowledge'. (Bukhari, v. 2 p. 201 and the Juzz Raful Yadayn ascribed to al-Bukhari, p. 58)

2) Imam al-Hakim said, "This is a condition of authenticity near to all the fuqaha (jurisprudents) of Islam that ziyada in chains and texts from thiqa (narrators) are accepted'... and he also said, 'Tafarrud (unique narrations) from thiqa are accepted'. (Muqaddima Mustadrak p. 42 and Mustadrak v. 1 p. 91)

3) Imam Abu Bakr al-Khatib (al-Baghdadi) said that the majority of the fuqaha and the companions of hadith (Ashab al-Hadith) have said that the ziyada of a thiqa is accepted even if he is the sole narrator. (Al-Kifaya fi ilm al-riwaya, p. 424)

4) Imam Nawawi said that the acceptance of a ziyada from a thiqa is obligatory... (Sharh Muslim lil-Nawawi, v.1, p. 219)

5) Imam Ibn Hajr said that a ziyada from a Sahih or hasan (good) narrator is accepted, as long as something contrary to it doesn't occur... till he said... because it is in the ruling of the independent (mustaqill) which a thiqa narrates alone. (Sharh Nukhbat al-Fikr, p. 45-46)

Because of this the narration of Ibn Umar is Sahih and objection to it is rejected and void. And for Allah is all praise.

Tenth Objection-

Zubayr Ali writes that the text of this hadith shows that the Messenger of Allah (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam), after migrating to Madina, he left doing raf'ul yadayn at the time of ruku'. But it is established through authentic channels that the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam), used to raise his hands in Madina at the time of ruku'. Then there is the hadith of Malik ibn al-Huwairith and Wa'il bin Hujr as narrated by Bukhari and Muslim. Wa'il bin Hujr came to the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) initially at the 9th year of Hijri and then again on the 10th year of Hijri. And in this year as well he witnessed the performance of raf'ul yadayn. As is narrated by Abu Dawud and Ibn Hibban.

First Reply-

Imam Ahmed mentioned the principle, 'The hadith in which the channels are not gathered it would not be understood, some hadith clarify other hadith'. (Al-Jami' al-Akhlaq al-Rawi lil-Khatib, v. 2, p. 212)

Based on this principle, if the narrations of Abdullah bin Umar (ra) are gathered then the matter will become apparent.

1) From Ibn Umar marfu'an (raised back to him) that he would raise his hands in ruku' and sujud. (Musannaf Ibn Abi Shayba v. 1 p. 266 it's chain is authentic (Sahih))

2) From him (Ibn Umar) marfu'an that he used to raise his hands at every lowering, rising, ruku, sujud, standing and sitting and between the two prostrations. (Mushkil al-Athar lil-Tahawi, v. 1 p. 46 and it's chain is authentic (Sahih) and Bayan al-Wahm wa-Ileham li Ibn al-Qattan, v. 5, p. 613 its chain is authentic)

3) And from him (Ibn Umar) marfu'an that he used to raise his hands during ruku and when making sajda (Juzz Raf'ul yadayn lil-Bukhari, p. 48, and it is Sahih)

4) And from him (Ibn Umar) marfu'an that he would raise his hands with every Takbir (Fath al-Mugith lil-Sakhawi, 2/323 and the additions of Faydur Rahman (Ghayr Muqallid) to al-Bukhari's Juzz on raf'ul yadayn, p. 68)

This means that Ibn Umar (ra) mentioned that it was a Madani practice to raise the hands at the time of ruku' and sujud. And the narration of Malik ibn al-Huwairith (ra) and Wa'il bin Hujr (ra) is also regarding the raising of the hands at the time of Sujud. These are in agreement, not in disagreement. Hence this objection of

contradiction is not correct, as the narration of Akhbarul Fuqaha is regarding after these Sahaba saw this practice. For Allah is all praise.

Second Reply-

It should be remembered that from authentic narrations it is established that Malik ibn al-Huwairith (ra), in his Madani life, performed raf'ul yadayn between the two prostrations. For example-

عن مالك بن الحويرث مرفوعا و اذا سجد و اذا رفع رأسه من السجود حتي يحاذي بهما فروع اذنيه 1)

(al-Mujtaba of Nasa'i, v1 p125 its chain is authentic, Sunan al-Kubra lil-Nasa'i, v. 1 p. 228, Musnad Ahmed it's chain is authentic)

عن مالك بن الحويرث مرفوعا و اذا رفع رأسه من السجود فعل مثل ذلك كله يعني رفع يديه 2)

(Al-Mujtaba of Nasa'i, 1/171 with a Sahih chain of transmission, Sunan al-Kubra lil-Nasa'i, 1/228 with a Sahih chain of transmission, Al-Muhalla of Ibn Hazm, 4/127-128 and he said it is Sahih (authentic))

عن مالك بن الحويرث مرفوعا كان يرفع يديه حيال فروع اذنيه في الركوع و السجود 3)

(Musnad Ahmed (5/66) and its chain is authentic and also in Sahih Abu Awana (2/95) and he said sahih (authentic))

Note-

Malik ibn al-Huwairith (ra) in the 9th year of Hijri came on a caravan with Banu Layth. And he spent 10 days with the Prophet as is mentioned in Bukhari. Then he returned back to his hometown. Whereas Abdullah bin Umar (ra) and others were with the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) until his demise and even remained in Madina. And Malik witnessed the Salah's of these individuals in which he saw them leaving the raising of the hands between sujud (prostration).

So back to Ali Zai, what ever reply he gives for leaving the raising of the hands between prostration, then that is the same reply we give for leaving it at the time of ruku'.

Third Reply-

Likewise it is established from Wa'il bin Hujr (ra) via complete and authentic narrations that he would raise his hands between prostrations. For example

عن وائل بن حجر مرفوعا و اذا رفع رأسه من السجود ايضا رفع يديه حتي فرغ من صلوة 1)

(Sunan of Abu Dawud its chain is authentic, Mu'jam al-Kabir of al-Tabarani, 22/28, its chain is authentic, Tamheed (of ibn Abd al-Barr), 9/227, its chain is authentic, Muhalla, 4/126, of Ibn Hazm and he said it is Sahih).

عنه مرفوعا كان يرفع يديه اذا ركع و سجد(2)

(Juz raf'ul-yadayn (of al-Bukhari), p. 45 and Sunan al-Daraqutni, 1/394, its chain is authentic)

3) It is said likewise in Sahih ibn Khuzayma (1/346) and he said Sahih and Sunan al-Tahawi (1/144) its chain is authentic.

Wa'il Ibn Hujr witnessed the raising of the hands at prostration (sajda) at the 9th year of Hijri, and then he returned back to his hometown. Then in the 10th year of Hijri he returned and prayed some Salah's in which he witnessed the same happenings. (Abu Dawud (1/112) with an authentic chain, Sharh al-Sunna lil-Baghawi, 3/27-28, Mu'jam al-Kabir of al-Tabarani, 22/39).

Then, Wa'il Ibn Hujr again returned back to his hometown. Within 80-90 days of his departing, the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) passed away. And these Salah's in the last few days were surely witnessed by Ibn Mas'ud, Ali, Ibn Umar, Bara ibn Aazib (radiallahu anhum) and others. They bear witness that the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) left the raising of the hands at the time of ruku' and sujud. And simply carried on raising of the hands at the beginning of the Salah. This is without a doubt an evidence for abrogation.

For Allah is all praise!

House of Verification